

93 00727

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY
MAY 6 1993
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1992 Amendment to the Housing Element of the General Plan

City of
Rancho Palos Verdes

August 1992

RANCHO PALOS VERDES CITY COUNCIL:

JOHN C. McTAGGART, MAYOR

SUSAN BROOKS, MAYOR PRO TEM

JACKI BACHARACH

STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

ROBERT E. RYAN

Prepared by:

City of Rancho Palos Verdes
Environmental Services Department

Adopted: August 18, 1992

1992 Amendment
to the
Housing Element
of the
General Plan

City of
Rancho Palos Verdes

August 1992



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C124910939>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>ATTACHMENT</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| I. Expanded Analysis of Special Housing Needs | 1 |
| II. Expanded Analysis of Parking Constraints for Multi-family Housing | 13 |
| III. Identification of Sites for Affordable Housing | 17 |
| IV. Identification of Programs to Mitigate Governmental Constraints | 35 |
| V. Expanded Program Descriptions | 48 |

LIST OF CHARTS AND TABLES

| <u>CHART/TABLE</u> | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Very Low Income -- Affordable Housing Costs | 3 |
| 2. Low Income -- Affordable Housing Costs | 3 |
| 3. Charts 1-3 -- City Rental Data: 1989 | 4 |
| 4. Charts 4-5 -- City Housing Survey: 1989 | 5 |
| 5. Parking Requirement Survey -- Area Cities | 14 |
| 6. Parking Requirements Applied to Sample Developments . . | 15 |
| 7. Chart 1 -- Multi-Family Zoned Sites/Densities | 20 |
| 8. Chart 2 -- Existing Multi-Family Developments With Non-Conforming Zoning | 23 |
| 9. Chart 3 -- Existing Units/Buildout Potential: 1989 . . . | 25 |
| 10. 5-Year RHNA Goals By Income Category | 28 |
| 11. Permit Processing Time Frames for 4 Peninsula Cities . . | 40 |
| 12. Table 25 (Revised) -- Program Implementation Actions . . | 51 |

ATTACHMENT I.

I. Expanded analysis of special housing needs

The following: (A) identifies the extent of the need in Rancho Palos Verdes; (B) analyzes the availability of potential resources and programs to address the need; and (C) identifies programs that would assist female-headed households.

A. The extent of the need for large family and female-headed households is:

1. Large family households

The State defines large family households as those that have over 5 persons living in them. The Housing Element states that in 1980 the City had 1,801 large family households (15.2% of the City households). In 1990, the City had a total of 14,943 occupied households with 1,500 large family (10% of the City households).

In 1970, there was an average of 3.8 persons per household. The 1980 Census indicated 3.04 persons per household. In 1990, the figure was 2.76 persons per household. This downward trend in persons per household is also reflected in the rise in the median age of the City's population. In 1970 the median age was 28.8, in 1980 it was 36.1 and in 1990 it was 41.9. These trends help to explain the decrease in the amount of large family households.

In 1981, the City conducted a survey to determine housing needs. At that time, affordability was determined by categories for families of two persons: low income was less than \$13,680 earned per year and moderate income was \$13,680 to \$20,520 earned per year. This survey revealed that 1% of the large family households were low income and overpaying for housing. The survey also determined that 1% of the large family households were moderate income and overpaying for housing.

Through extrapolation (using the 1981 survey percentages and the 1990 Census figures), there is a potential for 15 large family households that need assistance.

2. Female-headed households

The State defines a female-headed household as a family with a female householder and no spouse of householder (husband) present.

In the Housing Element we quote 1980 Census data stating that we have 1,823 female-head of households (representing 15.3% of all the City's households). In the Element, the City anticipated an increase in the number of female-headed households which would be determined by an expected increase in the elderly population, changes in marriage and divorce rates and a higher percentage of women in the work force.

However, the 1990 Census indicates a decrease in the number of female-headed households to 919. This is half of what it was in 1980.

The 1981 survey responded with 9% of the total female-headed households being low income and overpaying for housing. Thirteen percent of the total female-headed households were moderate income and overpaying for housing.

If we extrapolate for today's information, approximately 83 female-headed households are low-income and overpaying for housing, while there is a potential for 119 female-headed moderate income households overpaying for housing.

However, the State has changed the way it defines overpayment for housing. Existing need is now defined as the number of very low and low income households paying over 30% of their income for housing. According to the California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit, the Los Angeles area median income for a family of two is \$41,750. Very low income households are considered to make under 50% of the area median income and low income households are considered to make 80% of the area median income. For a family of two, this calculates to:

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| very low income | = \$20,874 per year |
| affordable rent | = 522 per month |
| affordable purchase | = 52,185 |
| low income | = \$33,400 per year |
| affordable rent | = 835 per month |
| affordable purchase | = 83,500 |

The City may now assume a potential need for 98 affordable units; 15 for large family households and 83 for female-headed households, until more detailed Census data is submitted to the City (which could then be applied to the new State definitions of overpayment). The availability of resources is determined by what affordable housing exists, what programs exist and what housing and programs could be made available (as discussed below under B and C).

B. The availability of potential resources and programs is as follows:

1. Federal programs

a. Section 8 Existing

Provides rent subsidies to low-income renters. The majority of rents in the City exceed the ceiling levels set for participation in the program. The 1990 Census breaks down monthly rental payments into categories. For

Rancho Palos Verdes, the following represents the City's rental data:

CHART 1

| <u>Census category</u> | <u>units</u> | <u>% of rental units</u> |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| less than \$ 250 | 41 | 1.4 |
| \$ 250 to 499 | 41 | 1.4 |
| \$ 500 to 749 | 161 | 5.5 |
| \$ 750 to 999 | 787 | 26.9 |
| \$ 1,000 or more | <u>1,896</u> | <u>64.8</u> |
| | <u>2,926</u> | <u>100.0%</u> |

HUD, in determining distribution of monies for this program, sets a ceiling on the amount of rent charged to a tenant that they will subsidize. For example, if a low income household is paying 40% of their income for rent and they are living in a unit that does not exceed the ceiling limits placed by HUD, then HUD may subsidize an amount of rent that would bring the cost down to 30% of their income. The following are the categories and rental limits placed by HUD:

CHART 2

| <u>type</u> | <u>HUD ceiling</u> |
|-------------|--------------------|
| efficiency | \$ 491 |
| 1 bedroom | 588 |
| 2 bedroom | 684 |
| 3 bedroom | 876 |

Unfortunately, the 1990 Census data that is currently available does not break down into comparable HUD categories with respect to type of unit (efficiency, 1 bedroom, etc.). However, a 1989 City housing study did have apartment units broken down into type. The following represents the 1989 figures extrapolated for the 1990 year:

CHART 3

| <u>type</u> | <u>number of rental units</u> | <u>% of rental units</u> |
|-------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| efficiency | 38 | 1.3 |
| 1 bedroom | 790 | 27.0 |
| 2 bedroom | 1,720 | 58.8 |
| 3 bedroom | <u>378</u> | <u>12.9</u> |
| | <u>2,926</u> total | <u>100.0%</u> |

The 1989 housing study also consisted of a survey of 712 apartment units which were categorized by rent costs (modified by Staff to be comparable with Census rent cost categories):

CHART 4

| <u>type</u> | <u>Census category</u> | <u>units</u> | <u>% of rental units</u> |
|-------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| efficiency | \$ 500 to 749 | 9 | 0.3 |
| 1 bedroom | \$ 500 to 749 | 6 | 0.2 |
| | \$ 750 to 999 | 186 | 7.1 |
| 2 bedroom | \$ 750 to 999 | 124 | 4.7 |
| | \$ 1,000 or more | 295 | 11.3 |
| 3 bedroom | \$ 1,000 or more | <u>92</u> 712 | <u>3.5</u> 27.1% |

If we took CHART 4 as representative of the City's apartment stock, it would appear that some of the 1 bedroom units may be eligible for the HUD subsidies. However, we know from CHART 1 that there are indeed units below the HUD ceilings. Actual unit breakdowns can be determined once more detailed Census data is received. For now, if we make the assumption that the smallest units pay the least for rent and then use the data from CHARTS 1, 3 and 4, the following estimates may apply:

CHART 5

| <u>type</u> | <u>Census category</u> | <u>units</u> | <u>% of rental units</u> |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| efficiency | less than \$ 250 | 29 | 1.0 |
| | \$ 500 to 749 | <u>9</u> | <u>0.3</u> |
| | | 38 | 1.3 |
| 1 bedroom | less than \$ 250 | 12 | 0.4 |
| | \$ 250 to 499 | 41 | 1.4 |
| | \$ 500 to 749 | 152 | 5.2 |
| | \$ 750 to 999 | <u>585</u> 790 | <u>20.0</u> 27.0 |
| 2 bedroom | \$ 750 to 999 | 202 | 6.9 |
| | \$ 1,000 or more | <u>1,518</u> 1,720 | <u>51.9</u> 58.8 |
| | | 378 | 12.9 |
| | | 2,926 | 100.0% |

CHART 5 may represent a more realistic distribution of units to rent. It shows that there may be 29 efficiency households that qualify for the HUD subsidies plus 53 (12 + 41) one bedroom units, and possibly no two or three bedroom households.

b. Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation

Provides for payment contracts on multi-family units needing moderate rehabilitation in conjunction with rental assistance. The 1989 housing survey considered the condition of the housing stock, but not for the existing multi-family units in the City. The City will assist the property owners of the multi-family units with information about this program and help coordinate applications.

c. Section 8 New Construction

Provides funding for the construction of housing affordable to lower income persons. High land costs and potential environmental constraints would appear to preclude the development of such projects in Rancho Palos Verdes. However, with the implementation of such programs as a density bonus ordinance, employer participation, and various other programs, provision of such affordable housing may become feasible.

d. Section 202

Provides funding for senior housing. In 1970, seniors (persons over 65 years old) represented 2.5% of the population. In 1980 there were 1,724 persons who were 65 or older (representing 4.7% of the City's population). The 1990 Census states 4,999 persons 65 years and older (representing 12% of the City's population). This increase is at a rate much higher than the County as a whole (9.3% in 1970, 9.9% in 1980, and 10% in 1990). Due to this substantial increase for the City, this program could be targeted to seniors in Rancho Palos Verdes.

Also, since the 1980 Census, the City has added 240 senior living units and has approved construction of an additional 250 units. Programs such as senior home sharing are also targeted towards this special needs group and programs providing subsidies to low income families would also be available.

e. Section 106(b) Seed Money Loans

Provides interest free loans to non-profit housing sponsors for preconstruction costs. This is currently used only in conjunction with Section 202 funds (senior

housing), as described above. For Rancho Palos Verdes, this money could possibly be used as part of a density bonus plan and towards the preconstruction costs of second units.

f. Community Development Block Grant

Provides funding for a wide range of community development activities. Rancho Palos Verdes currently uses these funds for the "Portuguese Bend Landslide Mitigation Project" and has allocated over \$1 million of CDBG funds (since 1984) for landslide mitigation efforts. This landslide is within the only redevelopment project area in the City. The project area includes the Abalone Cove and Portuguese Bend landslides, consists of approximately two square miles, and includes 219 homes which are slated for conservation through these landslide mitigation efforts and monies.

2. State programs

a. SB 99, Redevelopment Construction Loans

Authorizes issuance of bonds by redevelopment agencies. Due to recent litigation concerning the redevelopment project area and its tax increment funds, the City's redevelopment agency has been unable to issue bonds. Tax increment has also been indeterminable. However, the City expects to receive final tax increment figures from the County during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

b. California Housing Finance Agency

(1) Direct lending

Provides loans to housing sponsors for construction or rehabilitation of housing projects containing over five units. The City has 2,179 units that are within structures of five or more units (87% of these units are in structures containing ten or more units). As stated earlier, there are 2,729 apartment units in the City, so this direct lending program could be targeted towards the rehabilitation of 80% of the City's existing rental stock. Potential environmental constraints on new multi-family housing in the City may be a deterrent to development, but the program may be used in conjunction with a density bonus plan.

(2) Home ownership/improvement program

Provides financing of up to 49% of the purchase price of a mortgage participation loan with an institutional lender on behalf of income eligible households for rehabilitation and purchase of housing in areas that are in need of rehabilitation. The 1989 housing condition survey concentrated its efforts in the Eastview area of the City, which could be targeted with this program.

c. California Self-help Housing Program

Provides grants and loans to assist low and moderate income families to build and rehabilitate their own homes. High land costs and home values make the use of this program difficult for new construction in Rancho Palos Verdes, but rehabilitation may be feasible.

d. Mobile Home Park Assistance

Provides financial and technical assistance to mobile home park residents. The Housing Element states that there are no mobile home parks existing in the City. However, the 1990 Census specifies 100 mobile homes. This discrepancy may be due to the mobile home park at the eastern boundary of the City, along Palos Verdes Drive South, being included in a census tract that is both within Rancho Palos Verdes and Los Angeles (San Pedro). The census block data has not been published yet and the correct figure will be determined at that time.

e. Emergency Shelter

Provides grants for homeless shelters. The City does not believe such a program to be necessary, because there is no need for additional homeless shelters in the area. The homeless shelters that do exist within the City's vicinity are listed and discussed on page 11 of this report.

f. Special User Housing Rehabilitation

Program targeted towards substandard housing. The 1989 housing survey indicated 57 housing units in the Eastview area of the City that were in need of "major rehabilitation" (several minor and moderate level repairs necessary). This program could be targeted towards housing units such as these.

g. Predevelopment Loans

Provides predevelopment loans for low income housing projects. This source could be used by non-profit developers in the City. As stated before, high land costs and potential environmental constraints may hinder such development. However, with the implementation of programs such as a density bonus ordinance or certain standard conditions placed on developments, low income housing projects may be feasible.

h. Senior Citizen Shared Housing

Provides grants to assist seniors to find shared housing arrangements. This is an option for the City to pursue due to the increase in seniors over the past twenty years. Seniors' groups would be made aware of such arrangements and programs.

i. Rental Housing Construction

Provides cash grants for the construction of housing developments containing at least five units with 30 percent of the units affordable to lower income households. As with the direct lending program (page 7), this program could be targeted towards the rehabilitation of 80% of the City's existing rental stock. Potential environmental constraints on new multi-family housing in the City may be a deterrent to development, but the program may be used in conjunction with a density bonus plan.

j. Deferred Payment Rehabilitation Loans

Provides loans for the rehabilitation of low and moderate income housing. Again, certain sections of the City could be targeted for such a rehabilitation program.

k. Marks Foran Rehabilitation Loans

Allows revenue bonds for housing rehabilitation. It is known that there are housing units that are in need of rehabilitation and this is an option for the City to pursue.

l. AB 1151, Density Bonuses

Requires local governments to offer density bonuses or other incentives in exchange for the development of low income housing. The City has not adopted its own density bonus ordinance/program but will follow State requirements to implement such a program.

m. AB 655, Multi-family Revenue Bonds

Allows for participation in a County-wide bond program for low income multi-family housing. Environmental constraints on multi-family housing make it difficult to build new housing to meet the rent requirements of this program.

n. Single-family Mortgage Revenue Bonds

Allows for the issuance of bonds for below market loans for low and moderate income homebuyers. The high costs of homes and properties in the City make this difficult, but not impossible.

o. Redevelopment Tax Increment Financing

Allows local agencies to keep increases in taxes for redevelopment areas. Pursuant to State requirements, 20% of the incremental property tax revenues within the redevelopment project area must be set aside for the provision of low and moderate income housing. This tax increment has previously not been available for City use due to litigation proceedings. The County will be releasing the money in phases and has not been able to determine at this time how much tax increment the City will be receiving over time. However, as stated under the description of SB 99, redevelopment construction loans (page 7), the City expects to receive final tax increment figures from the County during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

3. Local programs

a. Second Unit Ordinance

The City is currently undergoing adoption procedures for a second unit ordinance which complies with State law and would allow for second units in all single-family and multi-family residential districts. After the ordinance is adopted, it will be submitted to the State for review.

b. Mobile Homes

Mobile homes are currently allowed within all single-family residential districts. The City has no account of any mobile homes located within its boundaries, although the 1990 Census has stated there are indeed 100 such units. This discrepancy will be further clarified once the City obtains more detailed Census information.

c. Density Bonus Ordinance

The City will be instituting a density bonus plan as soon as possible, in compliance with State law.

d. Programs for the homeless

City data indicate no record of homeless persons living in Rancho Palos Verdes. It appears that homeless persons wandering in the City merely use the City's roads for transition to other parts of the South Bay.

There are several organizations that provide emergency shelter, meals and other services to homeless persons in the area:

- (1) Harbor Interfaith Shelter (1420 Eighth Street, San Pedro)

Provides temporary shelter for families in a 16-unit apartment building. Families may stay a minimum of 60 days. The Shelter reports a 95% success rate in placing homeless families in permanent housing. The organization also operates a service program which offers welfare advocacy, food distribution, job referrals, and referral for medical and prenatal care.

- (2) His House (1103 Sartori Street, Torrance)

A church volunteer organization. Volunteers serve food to about 150 people each day. They also distribute free clothing and provide one-night hotel vouchers to the homeless on cold nights.

- (3) Salvation Army (4223 Emerald Street, Torrance)

Provides free food, clothing and transportation to the homeless. The Salvation Army also maintains intake facilities in San Pedro, Redondo Beach, Long Beach and Compton. From those facilities, people are referred to shelters in Westwood and downtown Los Angeles.

- (4) Beacon Light Mission (525 Broad Avenue, Wilmington)

Offers shelter to homeless men for a maximum of seven consecutive days. Breakfast and dinner are also served to the homeless each day.

(5) United Way

Offers 24-hour, 7 days a week information in English and Spanish to direct people in need to the nearest appropriate agency.

C. Programs to assist female-headed households are:

There are no programs, either at the federal or state level, that specifically address very low to low income female-headed households. Programs that could be utilized directly by this special needs group would be: Section 8 Existing, Moderate Rehabilitation, and New Construction; Section 202; Section 106(b) Seed Money Loans; California Housing Finance Agency Home ownership/improvement program; California Self-help Housing Program; Mobile Home Park Assistance; Special User Housing Rehabilitation; Senior Citizen Shared Housing; and Deferred Payment Rehabilitation Loans.

D. Existing assisted housing in the City

**1. Villa Capri
Hawthorne Boulevard, North of Palos Verdes Drive West**

Currently, ten (10) affordable housing exist in the City, each of which is located within the Villa Capri development (Tract No. 44239). Implementation of these units was achieved through a City Council condition of approval for the tract requiring the developer to set aside ten of the forty-nine multi-family zoned units as affordable housing. No governmental assistance was received for this program, as it was completely funded by the developer. Availability was limited to families earning incomes which were not greater than the median income for all residents in the City.

In accordance with HCD's concern that the Housing Element comply with Government Code Section 65583(a)(8) requiring analysis of assisted housing developments that may be eligible to change from low-income housing uses during the next ten years, Staff has reviewed the affordability constraints on the Villa Capri development and determined that these units, approved in 1986, may not be converted to market rate until the expiration of a thirty year term.

The City reviewed its housing records and determined that no other units are at risk of losing their assisted housing eligibility as no projects exist in the City which are administered through HUD (including but not limited to ELIHPA, LIHPRHA, FmHA projects), or Section 8 programs. CDBG funds are administered through the City's Redevelopment Agency and have, to date, been used for landslide mitigation programs.

ATTACHMENT II.

**Expanded analysis of parking constraints for
multi-family housing**

The Housing Element currently identifies the development standards, including the parking schedule, for multi-family units. Staff now provides: (A) a brief analysis of the existing parking requirements; (B) a survey of other cities' standards; (C) an example utilizing the cities' standards for a "high" density project; and (D) a conclusion as to whether these requirements pose a constraint to the development of housing for all income groups.

A. Existing parking requirements

The existing parking standards for multi-family housing in Rancho Palos Verdes are one covered (not enclosed, as HCD implies in their letter) space for each unit plus .5 spaces for each 0-1 bedroom unit and 1 space for each 2 or more bedroom units. In the RM-12 and RM-22 districts, 25% of the required parking is required to be added as guest parking.

B. City survey

A survey of cities in the area and other sections of the State with similar physical constraints revealed that Rancho Palos Verdes' parking requirements are straightforward and standard practice:

| <u>city</u> | <u>standards</u> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Palos Verdes Estates | 1 to 3 garage storage spaces/unit + 2 covered spaces/1 bedroom + .5 covered spaces for each additional bedroom + .25 guest spaces/unit |
| Rolling Hills Estates | discretionary condition through a RPD |
| Redondo Beach | 2 spaces/unit (50% covered) + an amount of guest spaces depending on the number of units, width of lot and zoning. |
| Hermosa Beach | 2 spaces/unit + .5 guest spaces/unit |
| Manhattan Beach | 2 spaces/unit for rentals (1 to be enclosed) |
| Big Bear Lake | 2 spaces/unit + a discretionary amount of guest spaces |
| Carlsbad | 2 spaces/unit (covered) + .5 guest spaces up to ten units and .3 guest spaces for ten units or more |
| Carmel | 1.5 spaces/unit |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Dana Point | 1.5 spaces/0 or 1 bedroom units + 2 spaces/2 bedroom units + 2.5 spaces/3 bedroom units + .5 spaces/every bedroom over 3 bedrooms (half of all parking must be covered) |
| La Canada-Flintridge | 2 spaces/1 or 2 bedroom units + 1 space for each additional bedroom + .5 guest spaces/unit |
| Laguna Beach | 1.5 spaces/studio or 1 bedroom units (50% covered) and 2/2 or more bedroom units (50% covered) + 1 guest space/every 4 units |
| Newport Beach | 2 spaces/unit for one to two units on a lot, or 2 spaces/unit + 1 guest space for three units on a lot, or 2.5 spaces/unit for four or more units on a lot |
| Pismo Beach | 1.5 spaces/unit + .25 guest spaces/unit for developments of more than eight units |
| Santa Barbara | 1.25 spaces/studio units + 1.5 spaces/1 bedroom units + 2 spaces/2 or more bedroom units + .25 guest spaces/unit for developments of six or more units |
| Sausalito | 1.5 spaces/0 or 1 bedroom units + 2 spaces/2 or more bedroom units |

C. Example

The following represents the above mentioned city standards when applied to a hypothetical development project. HCD designates a typical density for very low income housing as 25 to 40 units per acre. Using an example density of 30 units to the acre on a one acre parcel with 15 of the units 0-1 bedroom and 15 of the units 2 bedroom units, the following parking would be required by each city:

| <u>city</u> | <u>parking required for 30 units on 1 acre</u> |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rancho Palos Verdes | 67 spaces |
| Palos Verdes Estates | 142 spaces |
| Rolling Hills Estates | discretionary condition through a RPD |
| Redondo Beach | 60+ spaces |
| Hermosa Beach | 75 spaces |

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| Manhattan Beach | 60 spaces |
| Big Bear Lake | 60+ spaces |
| Carlsbad | 72 spaces |
| Carmel | 45 spaces |
| Dana Point | 53 spaces |
| La Canada-Flintridge | 75 spaces |
| Laguna Beach | 83 spaces |
| Newport Beach | 75 spaces |
| Pismo Beach | 53 spaces |
| Santa Barbara | 61 spaces |
| Sausalito | 53 spaces |

D. Conclusion

The Rancho Palos Verdes' parking standards do not pose a constraint to affordable housing, as they are the absolute minimum that the City can require and still provide adequate parking facilities for the development. Additionally, on-street parking would be detrimental to the public health and safety due to the relatively narrow and serpentine nature of the City's streets. Rancho Palos Verdes, as can be seen from the comparisons, is not requiring excessive standards for multi-family parking and in most instances our standards are less than that of similar cities' requirements. The cost for parking is negligible compared to other affordability constraints, such as land cost and environmental factors.

ATTACHMENT III.

Identification of sites for affordable housing

Pages V-20 through V-39 of the adopted Housing Element provide an extensive discussion of the vacant land available in the City. The following discusses: (A) the privately held vacant land (over ten acres) in the City that may be able to accommodate the City's regional share and needs; (B) the publicly held vacant land in the City that may be able to accommodate the City's regional share and needs; (C) the existing multi-family districts in the City; (D) a discussion of other City districts; (E) the amount of units that could potentially be built in the City; (F) jobs/housing analysis; and (G) substantial programs to assist the development of affordable housing.

A. Privately held vacant land

The Housing Element lists 20 individual sites that are privately owned, vacant land of ten acres or more. Three of these sites (totalling approximately 177 acres) are not yet committed for development, are not within the building restricted landslide moratorium area, and are described in the Element as follows:

1. Lower Montemalaga Canyon

The site is 41 acres and zoned OH (Open Space Hazard) and RS-A-5 (Residential single-family, 1 unit per 5 acres). Although the majority of the site comprises very steep slopes, it is anticipated that possibly 4 units could be constructed on this site.

2. Hawthorne Salvation Army

The site is 42 acres and is zoned I (Institutional) and most of the land comprises steep slopes. It has not been determined how many units could be built on the level portions of the site.

3. End of Barkentine Road

There are approximately 93 acres that are zoned OH and RS-1 (Residential single-family, 1 unit per acre). The constraints on this land are determined by limited access, steep slopes, and geologic concerns. The full development potential has not been analyzed at this time.

As shown from the discussion above, only one of the sites has a determined potential for development (Lower Montemalaga Canyon with a possible 4 units). The remaining two sites are undetermined for development potential.

B. Publicly held vacant land

The Housing Element lists 24 individual sites that are publicly held, vacant land. Of these 24 sites, approximately 84 acres are not committed for development and are not physically constrained for development. They are described in the Element as follows:

1. Pedregal School

The Pedregal School site is 8.4 acres and is zoned I and now contains school buildings and playing fields. It is presently leased to various community groups.

2. Loma Del Mar

The Loma Del Mar site is 8.5 acres and zoned residential and is located within the coastal specific plan district. Adjacent geology indicates the site may have physical constraints towards development.

3. Portuguese Bend Intermediate School

The site for the Portuguese Bend Intermediate School is 20 acres and is vacant, zoned I and OH. It is currently being partially used as a soccer field and is financially supported, in part, by the City.

4. Grandview Park

Grandview Park is a 17 acre vacant site and zoned OR (Open Space Recreation). It is currently owned by the City, purchased from the school district for park development.

5. Narbonne right-of-way

The Narbonne right-of-way is 6.1 acres of vacant land and was acquired by the County. Portions of this site have since been vacated or sold for development. It is zoned OH and RS-2.

6. RDA property in Portuguese Bend

The City Redevelopment Agency owns 10 acres in the Portuguese Bend landslide moratorium area. There is currently a restriction on building permit issuance due to the movement of land.

7. Martingale site

The site is 14 acres of completely unbuildable area (excessively steep slopes), entirely zoned OH. It is being preserved as open space and has recently been developed into a community park.

As shown from the discussion above, three of the sites have a potential for development (the Pedregal School, Loma Del Mar and Portuguese Bend Intermediate School sites). The remaining four sites are: (1) unbuildable (the RDA property in Portuguese Bend); or (2) committed for other use or development (Grandview Park, the Narbonne right-of-way and the Martingale park).

C. Multi-family districts

There are five multi-family zoning designations in the City (with the numerical reference to possible units per acre): RM-6, RM-8, RM-10, RM-12, RM-22. Currently, there are no sites that carry an RM-10 designation. The following is a list of all the multi-family zoned sites in the City grouped according to zone:

CHART 1

| zone | development area | type | units | acres | units per acre | potential units |
|------|----------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| RM-6 | Oceancrest/ Ocean Court | condo | 23 | 7.0 | 3.3 | 42 |
| | Peacock Ridge | single family | 1 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 1 |
| | Peacock Ridge | single family | 1 | 0.3 | 3.6 | 1 |
| | Peacock Ridge | condo | 4 | 0.3 | 13.8 | 1 |
| | Peacock Ridge | condo | 10 | 1.7 | 5.8 | 10 |
| RM-8 | Hawthorne/ Ridgegate | condo | 127 | 12.0 | 10.6 | 96 |
| | Hawthorne/ Highridge | condo | 99 | 12.0 | 8.3 | 96 |
| | Hawthorne/ Highridge | service station | 0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 16 |
| | Ridgecove | condo | 94 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 64 |
| | Ridgebluff | condo | 88 | 7.0 | 12.6 | 56 |
| | Ridgebrook | condo | 88 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 76 |
| | Ridgehaven Court | condo | 146 | 21.0 | 6.9 | 168 |

CHART 1 (continued)

| zone | development area | type | units | acres | units per acre | potential units |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| RM-12 | Radbrook/ Bearhaven | condo | 27 | 1.8 | 15.0 | 21 |
| | Radbrook/ Bearhaven | condo | 96 | 7.0 | 13.7 | 84 |
| | Toscanini | single family | 1 | 0.2 | 5.0 | 2 |
| | Western/ Toscanini | condo | 142 | 10.0 | 14.2 | 120 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| RM-12 | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | apartm | 4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Indian Valley | condo | 9 | 0.3 | 30.0 | 3 |
| | Hawthorne/ Oceancrest | apartm | 57 | 1.3 | 43.8 | 15 |
| | Hawthorne/ Oceancrest | condo | 30 | 1.0 | 30.0 | 12 |
| | Hawthorne/ Oceancrest | condo | 10 | 0.9 | 11.1 | 10 |
| | Hawthorne/ Oceancrest | apartm | 33 | 0.5 | 66.0 | 6 |

CHART 1 (continued)

| zone | development area | type | units | acres | units per acre | potential units |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------|-------|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| RM-12 (con.) | Hawthorne/ Oceancrest | condo | 167 | 4.0 | 41.8 | 48 |
| | Los Verdes Drive | apartm | 132 | 5.0 | 26.4 | 60 |
| | Los Verdes Drive | apartm | 124 | 5.0 | 24.8 | 60 |
| | Los Verdes Drive | apartm | 136 | 4.9 | 27.8 | 58 |
| RM-22 | Highridge/ Peacock | apartm | 16 | 0.3 | 53.3 | 6 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | apartm | 53 | 0.9 | 58.9 | 19 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | apartm | 21 | 0.5 | 42.0 | 11 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | apartm | 3 | 0.3 | 10.0 | 6 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | condo | 44 | 1.2 | 36.7 | 26 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | condo | 53 | 1.0 | 53.0 | 22 |
| | Highridge/ Peacock | condo | 10 | 0.3 | 33.3 | 6 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 29 | 1.2 | 24.2 | 26 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 255 | 5.2 | 49.0 | 114 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 38 | 0.8 | 47.5 | 17 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 96 | 2.4 | 40.0 | 52 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 30 | 0.7 | 42.9 | 15 |

CHART 1 (continued)

| zone | development area | type | units | acres | units per acre | potential units |
|-----------------|-------------------------|--------|-------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|
| RM-22 (con.) | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 69 | 1.3 | 53.0 | 28 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 38 | 0.8 | 47.5 | 17 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 88 | 2.6 | 33.8 | 57 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | apartm | 19 | 0.6 | 31.7 | 13 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | condo | 33 | 0.8 | 41.3 | 17 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | condo | 24 | 0.6 | 40.0 | 13 |
| | Hawthorne/ Ravenspur | condo | 21 | 0.7 | 30.0 | 15 |
| TOTALS | | | 2613 | 147.2 | 17.75 (average) | 1627 |

The following is a list of existing multi-family developments with single-family, or other, zone designations:

CHART 2

| zone | development area | type | units | acres | units per acre | potential units |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------------------|-----------------|
| RS-1 | La Rotunda | condo | 100 | 5.6 | 17.7 | 5 |
| RS-4 | Seagate Drive | condo | 240 | 17.6 | 13.6 | 70 |
| | Seagate Drive | apartm | 115 | 5.6 | 20.5 | 5 |
| I | Western Avenue | senior home | 71 | 1.0 | 71.0 | n/a |
| TOTALS | | | 526 | 29.8 | 17.7 (average) | 80 |

As can be seen from CHART 1, most of the existing developments already exceed the allowed densities of the City's current zoning: 43 of the 52 sites exceed their allowable densities. This means that the City has 37% more units, existing, than they have zoned for (988 units more than zoned for). The State defines density ranges and housing types needed to accommodate the housing needs of low and moderate income groups as:

| | |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| very low | multi-family rental: 25-40 du/ac |
| low | multi-family rental: 18-25 du/ac |
| moderate | rental and owner: 8-18 du/ac |

CHART 1 shows that, out of 52 separate sites, 24 sites now fall under the very low density range (as set by the State, above). Out of these 24 sites, 13 exceed the highest density from the State (40 dwelling units per acre) and go as high as 66 units per acre. CHART 1 also shows two sites that fall within the low density category. Five sites are not built to their potential and an additional 61 units could be accommodated.

CHART 2 depicts 3 sites that are already overbuilt with an excess of 375 units (calculations exclude the senior home categorized under the Institutional district).

D. Other City districts

The remaining areas are either commercially designated land or residential single-family districts that are built out (established single-family residential neighborhoods that have been in existence for some time or recently developed). Additionally, there are no multi-family infill sites in the City. The existing infill sites are located in established single-family residential areas. The City's Development Code is currently undergoing revision and proposes to allow manufactured housing and mobile homes in all single-family residential areas, along with second units on a lot. It is anticipated that an additional 50 units will be provided on the single-family infill lots and that an additional 60 units will be provided by second units, within the next five years.

The estimate of additional housing units on infill lots has been determined through an analysis of building permits over the past five years and projected out into the next five years. However, because the housing units to be constructed on the infill lots in the City are generally located in established neighborhoods, the new units mostly represent replacement units for ones that have been torn down. A more conservative estimate for vacant infill lots would be 25. The estimate of second unit construction was determined by extrapolating from the per year amount of second unit covenants issued by the City for second units over the past five years.

As for redevelopment potential (meaning recycled to a residential use or to a higher residential density) this is shown in Chart 1 by

comparing the units built to the potential units. If the potential units number is higher than the existing units number, then that is how many units could be added when recycled. The sites with this recyclable potential are again shown in Chart 3, following. There is one site that is currently not a residential use that is zoned residential and which could accommodate possibly 16 units. The rest of those in Chart 1 (and Chart 3) could accommodate an additional 45 units ($22 + 19 + 1 + 3 = 45$) for a total of 61 additional units if the sites are recycled to their potential.

Remaining vacant sites are either slated for single-family residential development or are zoned for such within the above mentioned established neighborhoods (infill sites). The City's proposed second unit ordinance (as discussed in Attachment I, page 10) will help provide affordable housing in these areas.

E. Potential units/buildout units

The following provides a list of all units built in the City since 1989 and an educated estimate of the amount of units that can be built in the City (within its current zoning densities). The categories of very low, low, and moderate were assigned not with the intent that those exact sites would accommodate that particular housing, but rather to demonstrate that the City does indeed have enough (really more than enough) sites available for the accommodation of affordable housing as designated in our RHNA goals:

CHART 3

| zone | development area | existing units | potential units | difference | RHNA category |
|------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| RM-8 | Hawthorne/ Highridge (from Chart 1) | 0 | 16 | 16 | very low |
| RM-8 | Ridgehaven Court (from Chart 1) | 146 | 168 | 22 | very low |
| I | Portuguese Bend Intermediate School (partial estimate from discussion under subsection B, above) | n/a | 25 | 25 | very low |
| | ----- | | | | |
| | subtotal | | | 63 | very low |
| | ----- | | | | |

CHART 3 (continued)

| zone | development area | existing units | potential units | difference | RHNA category |
|--------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| RM-6 | Oceancrest/ Ocean Court (from Chart 1) | 23 | 42 | 19 | low |
| RM-12 | Toscanini (from Chart 1) | 1 | 2 | 1 | low |
| RM-22 | Highridge/ Peacock (from Chart 1) | 3 | 6 | 3 | low |
| RS-A-5 | Lower Montemalaga Canyon (from discussion under subsection A, above) | n/a | 4 | 4 | low |
| I | Hawthorne Salvation Army (estimated from discussion under subsection A, above) | n/a | 5 | 5 | low |
| RS-1 | End of Barkentine (estimated from discussion under subsection A, above) | n/a | 5 | 5 | low |
| I | Portuguese Bend Intermediate School (partial estimate from discussion under subsection B, above) | n/a | 25 | 25 | low |
| RS-1 | second units (partial anticipation) | n/a | 30 | 30 | low |
| I | Point Vicente (for enlisted men) | n/a | 27 | 27 | low |
| <hr/> | | | | 124 | low |
| <hr/> | | | | | |

CHART 3 (continued)

| zone | development area | existing units | potential units | difference | RHNA category |
|-------|---|----------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|
| I | Marriott Life Care Facility (approved for development) | n/a | 12 | 12 | moderate |
| I | Pedregal School (estimated from discussion under subsection B, above) | n/a | 20 | 20 | moderate |
| RS-1 | Loma Del Mar School (estimated from discussion under subsection B, above) | n/a | 8 | 8 | moderate |
| RS-1 | second units (partial anticipation) | n/a | 30 | 30 | moderate |
| <hr/> | | | | 71 | moderate |
| RS-1 | infill sites (anticipated) | n/a | 25 | 25 | above moderate |
| RS-1 | Subregion 7 & 8 (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 83 | 83 | above moderate |
| RS-1 | Marguerite Drive (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 4 | 4 | above moderate |
| RS-1 | Subregion 1 (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 79 | 79 | above moderate |

CHART 3 (continued)

| zone | development area | existing units | potential units | difference | RHNA category |
|---------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|
| RS-1 | West of Yacht Harbor (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 10 | 10 | above moderate |
| RS-1 | Forrestal & Pirate Drive (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 42 | 42 | above moderate |
| RS-1 | Highridge & Crest (submitted for approval since adoption of the Element in 1990) | n/a | 76 | 76 | above moderate |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| subtotal | | | 388 | | above moderate |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| TOTAL HOUSING UNITS | | | 657 | | |

The Housing Element concludes (on page V-20) that the 502 units designated by the RHNA are able to be accommodated (the RHNA housing goals are provided by the Southern California Association of Governments - SCAG). The City's 5-year RHNA need is outlined below:

| | <u>units</u> |
|----------------|--------------|
| very low | 38 |
| low | 46 |
| moderate | 52 |
| above moderate | <u>366</u> |
| | 502 |

As can be seen from Chart 3, the City will not only meet its RHNA needs, but it is possible the City could exceed it. Chart 3 not only depicts the meeting of the RHNA goals, but it also depicts City buildout. Although the City is actively committed to the pursuit and implementation of programs for affordable housing, the flux of the economy, finance availability, developer willingness to

participate, and market rates are all factors out of the City's hands.

The City's existing zoning allows sufficient densities for the construction of housing for all income groups and for the construction of either all the housing required by the RHNA or for the construction of the maximum number of units possible. The City's existing zoning is not a constraint to housing supply. Also, no low and moderate income persons were displaced from the coastal zone, so special programs for that are not necessary.

F. Jobs/housing analysis

The concept of a jobs/housing balance is regional. A balance is considered when the number of housing units in a given area is only slightly less than the employment opportunities. In theory, this means that people living in the area are able to also work in the area. The benefits of achieving this balance include reduced traffic congestion resulting in decreased commuter times resulting in fewer emissions resulting in cleaner air resulting in a reduction of major capital expenditures.

In 1984, SCAG defined a balanced region where the ratio of jobs to housing was 1.27. This means 1.27 jobs for every housing unit. For the year 2010, SCAG defines the ratio at 1.20. Unfortunately, housing affordability is not figured into the equation.

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes is located in the Santa Monica Bay subregion. It is predicted by SCAG that this subregion could experience an increase of 309,000 persons, 146,900 units and 253,000 jobs during the period between 1984 and 2010. In 1984, this subregion had a jobs/housing ratio of 1.46, which makes the subregion "jobs rich." By 2010, SCAG predicts the ratio to be closer to 1.52. Even though Rancho Palos Verdes is obviously a "jobs poor" city, the employment base for the subregion is more than adequate.

G. Programs to assist in the development of affordable housing

The Element identifies programs to assist with the development of affordable housing for those sites that could accommodate such development (pages V-43 and V-44 of the Element). Additional programs have been included in Attachment I (page 3) of this report.

What faces the City of Rancho Palos Verdes, and the Peninsula as a whole, are the potential environmental constraints on increased density for new construction. Our General Plan provides for sensitive analysis towards the preservation of this delicate environment. To reiterate the main points/constraints brought up in the Housing Element (starting on page V-36 of the Element):

"Because of the complex nature of the City's geology and the existing and potential concerns about slope stability, development in Rancho Palos Verdes is closely managed.... The vast majority of available acreage is in the coastal zone, the area of the City most constrained by physical features such as geologic hazards, marginal geologic stability, extreme slopes, natural resource areas and flood hazards.... While the City will consider proposals for affordable housing on any of the available residential parcels, proposed projects will be evaluated to address substantial constraints such as environmental impacts, provision of open space, and adequacy of infrastructure.... The physical conditions existing in Rancho Palos Verdes present very real limitations to the City's ability to increase existing residential densities or to intensify existing development."

It is then stated in the Element (page V-39) that due to the physical factors involved, construction costs "...are likely to increase total [development] costs by 50% or more over standard regional costs" (discussed further in Attachment IV). Prospective affordable housing in the City would have to rely on program subsidies and not density in, and of, itself. This is illustrated when the data in Attachment I (starting with the charts on page 4) is compared to the data in Charts 1 and 2 above: 55% of the existing multi-family units are within the developments that exceed the State's designated density for very low income projects, yet only 3% (82 units from page 5, representative from CHART 5) of the City's rental units pay the low rent available for potential HUD subsidies. Lenders do not perceive the City as a distinct market. Mortgage programs will have to be implemented through state or federal programs in conjunction with the local lenders.

ATTACHMENT IV.

**Identification of programs to mitigate governmental
constraints**

HCD suggests that the City identify programs, if necessary, to remove or mitigate any identified governmental constraints. The following: (A) lists the potential constraints; and (B) identifies the programs to either remove those potential constraints or mitigate them.

A. Constraints

The Housing Element has identified the potential governmental constraints in pages V-5 through V-19. The following expands that discussion and compares the Rancho Palos Verdes constraints to other Peninsula cities:

1. Land use and development controls

In each residential zoning district in the City (and in most cities) a minimum lot size is established. Rancho Palos Verdes has six single-family residential designations and five multi-family residential designations. As listed in Tables 14 and 15 of the Housing Element (pages V-9 and V-10), the minimum lot sizes for single-family districts range from five acres (the RS-A-20 zone has been deleted from the Development Code) to 8,000 square feet (almost 1/5 acre).

The minimum lot sizes listed for multi-family developments could be translated to maximums of 6 to 22 units per acre for RM-6 through RM-22 designations. These are maximums and actual development potential is usually less due to such factors as the topography and configuration of the site, easements, roadways, etc.

As stated in the Housing Element (page V-7), while most of the City is zoned and established at single-family residential densities, almost 20% of the existing housing stock is multi-family units.

Rolling Hills has only two single-family residential zoning categories and no multi-family zones. The residential minimum lot sizes are one and two acres. There are no existing multi-family developments in the City.

Rolling Hills Estates classifies their residential zones into four categories, ranging from a minimum lot size of one acre to 10,000 square feet. As with the City of Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates does not currently designate any land with a specific multi-family designation, but the City does allow for multi-family development through a RPD (Residential Planned Development). Housing developed under a RPD, however, typically follows the standards of the R-A-10,000 zone. Consequently, only 1% of their existing housing stock is multi-family.

The City of Palos Verdes Estates has one single-family residential designation of RS and one multi-family designation of RM. With the single-family zone, there is no minimum lot size standard, but a minimum lot size may be imposed by the homeowners' association through any applicable conditions, covenants and restrictions. The maximum units per acre in the multi-family district is 24. Again, this is a maximum and actual development potential is usually less. The Palos Verdes Estates' housing stock consists of 7% existing multi-family residential units.

The City of Rancho Palos Verdes does not consider their minimum lot sizes as constraints. The above comparison of the surrounding cities demonstrates that not only does Rancho Palos Verdes have in place a variety of multi-family designations, the City carries 86% of all the multi-family units on the Peninsula (with the City having only 64% of the Peninsula population).

2. Second units

The allowance of second units on a lot are listed in the Housing Element (page V-11) as a potential constraint. Since the adoption of the Housing Element in September 1990, the City has been in the process of revising its Development Code, and is proposing a second unit ordinance in compliance with State law. The ordinance is really the opposite of a constraint to affordable development and should instead be considered a catalyst.

The proposed second unit ordinance provides standards for the development and maintenance of second units on residential lots in accordance with California State Government Code Section 65852.2. The ordinance would ensure that second units in residential districts are developed and operate on adequate sites, at proper and desirable locations, and that the goals and objectives of the general plan are observed. Second units are not considered to exceed the allowable density for the lots upon which they are located and are deemed to be a residential use consistent with the existing general plan and zoning designations for the lot. Further, second unit developments are allowed in all RS and RM districts.

3. Manufactured housing and mobile homes

Manufactured housing and mobile homes are also a catalyst to affordable development, and not a constraint. Such homes are allowed in all residential zones, both single-family and multi-family, and could be used as second units. Also, the construction of manufactured or mobile homes is not likely to be constrained by topography or access to any greater degree than standard single-family dwellings.

4. Density bonus law

Although listed under the constraint category in the Housing Element, the State's density bonus law actually promotes the development of affordable housing. The law requires a City to grant a density bonus of at least 25% to a housing development which provides:

- a. 20% of the units for low income households;
- b. 10% of the units for very low income households; or
- c. 50% of the units for senior citizens.

The City will be preparing its own density bonus ordinance, in compliance with the State law, during Fiscal Year 1992-93. Until then, the City will follow all the State requirements of the law.

5. Landslide moratorium

To expand upon the description of the moratorium in the Housing Element (page V-12), in September 1978 the City placed an approval and permit moratorium in the southern, most central, section of the City. It encompasses approximately two square miles with 219 single-family homes.

As stated in the Rancho Palos Verdes Coastal Specific Plan, the landslide was triggered by construction activity associated with an attempt to extend Crenshaw Boulevard to Palos Verdes Drive South, in the Portuguese Bend section of the City. The County was eventually found liable for damages incurred by property owners in the area. The landslide was so detrimental that relocation was necessary. A subdivision to the east of the area took the relocated housing. The halting of the extension of Crenshaw Boulevard, and the subsequent activation of the landslide, curbed development of large land areas that are now within the moratorium area. As it is well known, transportation access routes play an important role in the development of land. Not only has the extension of Crenshaw Boulevard been abandoned, but other subsequent extension plans (of other routes connecting the coast) have been abandoned as well. Aside from additional access routes, the landslide continues to move and along with it Palos Verdes Drive South. With the coastal bluffs to the south of Palos Verdes Drive South and the landslide to the immediate north of the road pushing it southward to the ocean, constant repair and alteration is underway for that portion of Palos Verdes Drive South. It has been, and must remain (as long as the landslide moves in this area), a two-lane, narrow, serpentine and bumpy road with limited capacity.

The landslide itself is not a governmental constraint to affordable development. It is an act of nature. Also, while the City imposed moratorium restricts development (for obvious reasons) it is conclusively not a constraint to development. But rather, as the Uniform Building Code and local amendments are viewed (discussed below), as a protective measure to the public health, safety and welfare.

6. Building codes and enforcement

State law requires the City to adopt and enforce the Uniform Building Code (UBC). Surrounding cities, and almost every city in California, utilize the UBC. The UBC is a document "...dedicated to the development of better building construction and greater safety to the public by uniformity in building laws. The code is founded on broad-based performance principles that make possible the use of new materials and new construction systems."

Due to its unique climatic, topographical and geological characteristics, the City of Rancho Palos Verdes has, through Chapter 15.04 of its Municipal Code, implemented local amendments to the Uniform Building Code (UBC). These amendments include storm damage precautions, fire retardant roofing, and geological and geotechnical reports for the evaluation and elimination of hazards. The City does not consider these local amendments to the UBC to be more restrictive than is necessary to protect the public health and safety due to the hazards arising from the City's climate, topography and geology, and are not intended to act as constraints to the housing supply.

7. Energy conservation

The Housing Element states that the City's Building Code requires compliance with Title 24 energy conservation standards for new construction (page V-13). Title 24 refers to the California Code of Regulations as it encompasses the UBC. Specifically, all new buildings in California must meet State Building Energy Efficiency Standards in accordance with the California Administrative Code, Title 20, Chapter 2, Subchapter 4, Article 1 and the compliance requirements of Title 24, Part 2, Chapter 2-53. All new construction must comply with the standards set forth in Chapter 2-53 that are in effect on the date a building permit application is filed.

It is through these sections of the California Government Code, and by the Warren-Alquist Act, that the California Energy Commission regulates building design and construction standards which increase the efficiency in the use of energy for new residential and new nonresidential buildings. The standards the Commission sets are geared towards cost

effectiveness when amortized over the economic life of the structure (when compared with historical practice).

The standards themselves deal with such construction regulations as minimum ceiling and wall insulation, weatherstripping for doors and windows, slab edge insulation, damper controls for exhaust systems, and intermittent ignition devices for gas fired appliances. It is conclusive that compliance with the State Building Energy Efficiency Standards is not a constraints to development. If the City were somehow to relax those regulations, substandard housing would result. It is not the goal of the City to provide the means for affordable housing with a "quick-fix" of upfront costs at the expense of long term economic and health benefits.

Along with the enforcement of the UBC, the Housing Element, on page V-13, states that the City's environmental review procedures also "...require analysis of energy conservation measures as part of any proposed project. The California Environmental Quality Act exempts those projects over which public agencies have ministerial authority. Typically, single-family residential construction is a ministerial duty of the City and is therefore exempt from environmental review. Multi-family residential uses in multi-family zones are also ministerial and would therefore not require environmental review. However, this would not apply to such ministerial projects that are proposed for known environmentally sensitive areas or would create an adverse cumulative impact. The following lists those housing activities that are considered in the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines to be exempt from review:

- a. The repair or maintenance of residential structures;
- b. Additions to existing structures as long as the addition is not:
 - (1) 50% or more of the existing floor area or 2,500 square feet (whichever is less); or
 - (2) 10,000 square feet as long as the area is not environmentally sensitive and all public services are existing for maximum development consistent with the General Plan.
- c. Division of multi-family rental units to condominiums;
- d. Replacement of existing units where the new structure will be located on the same site as the structure replaced and will have substantially the same purpose and capacity;

- e. The sale of surplus government property (except for parcels located in an area of "concern");
- f. The division of property, zoned residential, into four or fewer parcels when the division is in conformance with the General Plan, no variances or exceptions are required, all services and access to the proposed parcels to local standards are available, the parcel was not involved in a division of a larger parcel within the previous two years, and the parcel does not have an average slope greater than 20%;
- g. Approval of a tentative map or parcel map if an Environmental Impact Report was approved for a project and findings of overriding consideration were made; and
- h. Actions by a redevelopment agency, housing authority, or other public agency to implement an adopted Housing Assistance Plan by acquiring an interest in housing units. The housing units may be either existing or possessing all required permits for construction.

The above are not constraints. Compliance with Title 24 is a requirement of the State. A City is not within its rights to come up with a program to mitigate State mandates. Also, the environmental review of energy conservation measures applies to only those projects for which there is an environmental review required. As can be seen from the above exemption list, many residential projects are exempt from the review process, and therefore the energy conservation analysis (referred to in the Housing Element) would not be a constraint. If a residential project is determined to not be exempt, then it must comply with the State mandated review under the California Environmental Quality Act. Again, this is State law and it applies to every city in California, so it cannot be considered a constraint by the City.

8. Off-site and site improvements

The site improvements that the City requires assures that all of the needed physical components are in place before title transfer occurs. As outlined in the Element (page V-14), the improvements include the following:

- a. Street or alley paving/repaving;
- b. Sidewalks, curbs and gutters;
- c. Street trees;

- d. Ornamental street lights;
- e. Sewer and drainage facilities; and
- f. Easements and dedications.

The Element goes on to state that in most cases, many of the above mentioned improvements are not required. In the case of street paving, the City's standards are generally less expensive than the County's specifications. Also, sewer improvements are only for on-site and then to the hook up point. Drainage improvements are required for all effected down-hill areas that would become inadequate with the new development. Additionally, most city's in the County require more stringent improvements than Rancho Palos Verdes does. It is for these reasons that the City concludes that the existing site improvements required are not a constraint to development, or to the development of affordable housing. The undergrounding of utilities could be waived for affordable projects.

9. Infrastructure

The Housing Element points out (on page V-15) that water, sewer, drainage and roadway infrastructure is adequate for most of the City. The Element concludes that improvements to infrastructure does not provide a constraint to development, because it is usually taken care of by the City and out of the general fund, administered through the City's capital improvements program. Also, the County improves and maintains the City's sewer systems.

A development incurs infrastructure costs mostly for their on-site improvements. One area of the City is inadequately served by infrastructure and that is the Portuguese Bend Club area. This land, however, is entirely privately owned. This means that the residents are responsible for the upgrading and maintenance of the system.

The capital improvements program outlines needed improvements and also delineates construction of new infrastructure for those areas that are lacking in it. The following outlines those improvements for the fiscal year 1991-92:

- a. Hawthorne Boulevard - Crest Road to Indian Peak Road
(overlay with fabric)
- b. Granvia Altamira - Hawthorne Boulevard to Palos Verdes Estates City limits (overlay with fabric)
- c. Armaga Spring Road - Indian Valley Road to Quailhill Road
(overlay with fabric)

- d. Palos Verdes Drive South - Wayfarers Chapel to Hawthorne Boulevard westbound (reconstruction)
- e. Grading improvements (grading and cleaning of Portuguese Canyon to restore natural drainage)
- f. Gabion enhancement (construction of shoreline protection to prevent erosion of material on temporary basis)
- g. Ladera Linda Community Center and Portuguese Bend field - roof replacement, hardcourts, and site amenities (Second phase of a multi-year project to replace the roofs on all buildings at the Community Center. One roof will be replaced each year over the next three years. The basketball and handball court is in need of resurfacing due to age. Install park benches throughout for park patrons.)
- h. Rancho Palos Verdes Park - service access reconstruction (The driveway to the handicapped parking lot and the services yard needs to be rebuilt due to failing asphalt. Proposed improvements are to rebuild the driveway and install guardrails.)

And as stated in 8., above, the site improvements that the City requires assures that all of the needed physical components are in place before title transfer occurs. In most cases, many of the above mentioned improvements are not required. In the case of street paving, the City's standards are generally less expensive than the County's specifications. It is for these reasons that the City concludes that the existing site improvements, and infrastructure, required are not a constraint to development, or to the development of affordable housing. The undergrounding of utilities could be waived for affordable projects.

10. Permit Processing Times

As the existing Housing Element states on page V-16, the City's permit processing times are similar to those in the South Bay communities, as is illustrated in the following chart:

| <u>Permit</u> | <u>Time frames</u> | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| | <u>RPV</u> | <u>RHE</u> | <u>PVE</u> | <u>RH</u> |
| Site plan review | immediate | 4 days | 4 wks | 12 wks |
| Grading (minor) | immediate | n/a | 6 wks | n/a |
| Grading (major) | 8-12 wks | 6 wks | 6 wks | 12 wks |
| Certificate or Compliance | 6-8 wks | n/a | n/a | 12 wks |
| Lot line adj. | 6-8 wks | 8 wks | 9 wks | 12 wks |
| Height variation | 8-12 wks | 12 wks | n/a | n/a |
| Minor exception | 8-12 wks | 6 wks | n/a | 12 wks |
| Environmental Assessment | 8-12 wks | 2 wks | 4 wks | 1 wk |
| Zone change | 12 wks | 26 wks | 13 wks | 12 wks |
| Variance | 8-12 wks | 6-8 wks | 6-7 wks | 12 wks |
| General Plan amendment | 24-40 wks | 6-8 wks | 6-7 wks | 12 wks |
| Conditional Use Permit | 12-48 wks | 6-8 wks | 4 wks | 12 wks |
| EIR | 12-48 wks | 52 wks | 52 wks | 52 wks |
| Tentative parcel map | 8-24 wks | 52 wks | 9 wks | 52 wks |
| Tentative tract map | 96-192 wks | 52 wks | 9 wks | 52 wks |

Additionally, there are state mandates as to noticing requirements and public comment/review periods that are really what make the process the lengths that they are. Due to this comparison and the fact the it is really the state requirements that extend the time frames, the City concludes that their processing times are not a constraint to affordable housing.

11. Dedications and fees

The Housing Element states (on page V-15) that dedications and fees for a residential project are generally required of only new subdivision maps and not for improvements on existing lots. Such fees are based on the actual cost of providing

needed infrastructure and public services. The determination of such fees is widely variable, depending on the value of the land and the number of units proposed. Planning approval and building permit fees, however, are required for all development projects. Projects within the Coastal Specific Plan area must also receive a Coastal Permit, which requires discretionary review. If a residential project requires approval of multiple applications, all are moved through the process together and at the same time. The standard fees of the planning department are listed on page V-18 and are concluded that they are not excessive as compared to surrounding cities and are therefore not a constraint to development (especially when compared to the constraint of land value). The time for processing is also not considered a constraint because that is also comparable to other cities' permit processing schedules. Incentives could be given, however, to streamline the process for any discretionary review related to an affordable housing project, but State noticing requirements would still have to be met.

In conclusion, the majority of the above governmental regulations are not considered constraints. Section B (below) summarizes programs to mitigate the above listed standards that are considered to be potential governmental constraints. Attachment V, page 44, expands on the entire list of housing programs that were adopted in the Element on page VII-3 and the additional programs that have been discussed throughout this report.

The City pledges to remove or relieve somehow potential government constraint, if appropriate and legally possible. This amendment changes the previous Housing Element conclusions that a number of the City's land use policies constrain housing supply.

B. Programs to mitigate potential governmental constraints

1. Second unit ordinance

As stated on page 10, the City is currently undergoing adoption procedures for a second unit ordinance which complies with State law and would allow for second units in all single-family and multi-family residential districts. After the ordinance is adopted, it will be submitted to the State for review. The allowance of second units on residential lots will, in effect, eliminate the high land cost that has been pointed out so many times in this report as the main constraint to development on the Peninsula. It will also, inevitably, increase the value of the existing property. The rental assistance and senior programs listed in Attachment I would then be coordinated with such second unit developments and incentive programs would be provided to the applicant for participation into those programs.

2. On-site employee housing

The City will prepare site development standards requiring on-site employee housing through a specific plan and/or a conditional use permit. Each major development project within the City will be considered in light of these new standards. As stated in the Housing Element, the majority of the City's RHNA was based on anticipated large commercial development that has been proposed. As affordable housing needs (RHNA) in Rancho Palos Verdes is employment driven, the purpose of this program is to make developers provide some housing, or a housing fee, for those very low, low and moderate income employees. SCAG determined that approximately 84 units of the RHNA reflect the need created by this new commercial development. The on-site employee housing plan would promote the fulfillment of the need, proportionally.

The City will determine the number of affordable housing units to be provided by each project on a case-by-case basis. This is necessary because federal and state law require the City to demonstrate a nexus between a particular development project and any affordable housing requirements imposed on that project. In general, however, the City expects 84 units to be created under this program during the life of this Element.

3. Affordable housing fund

The City will evaluate and, if feasible, implement a development fee for commercial and residential development to be allocated to an affordable housing fund to be used in the event such development is approved in the next five years. If considered prior to adoption of the fee, each of those projects will be analyzed to incorporate housing requirements as part of the conditional use permit process.

4. Senior home sharing program

The City will coordinate the implementation of a senior home sharing program with the Peninsula Seniors, Los Angeles County, etc. Such a program is anticipated to be established during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

5. Permit tracking system

The City will establish a permit tracking system identifying second units, lots that could accommodate second units, and lots that could accommodate additional housing for the City. Such information would be provided to the public at no cost, or at a minimal cost.

6. Development Code revisions

The City is currently undertaking a comprehensive revision of the Development Code. Certain revisions will now allow Staff authority to approve certain types of permits which currently require Planning Commission or City Council consideration. The revisions are now before the City Council and adoption is anticipated to occur during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

7. Density bonus plan

The City will develop an ordinance implementing the State density bonus law. The ordinance would provide incentive to developers of residential projects to provide affordable units or senior units with an increase in their allowable densities. The ordinance would also provide an intensity bonus for commercial projects to provide affordable or senior units in exchange for increased square footage, for example.

8. Manufactured/mobile housing provisions

The City will continue to comply with State law requiring all cities to allow for manufactured housing (mobile homes) within all residential districts. The Development Code revisions mentioned above also include clarification of this requirement. As stated on page 10, the City now allows manufactured housing and mobile homes in all residential areas of the City.

ATTACHMENT V.

Expanded program descriptions

The following: (A) responds to specific HCD questions regarding Housing Element programs numbered 2, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 16; and (B) supplements the Element with more detailed program descriptions by committing to ensure that the City can meet housing element program requirements, specifying funding sources, quantifying objectives of the program, and specifying steps to be taken by the City to implement the programs (provided in a revised implementation table).

A. Response to specific HCD questions:

Program #2: Evaluate opportunities to fund rehabilitation of low/moderate income housing.

1. What funding programs/sources will be evaluated?

The funding programs/sources that will be evaluated are outlined in Attachment I, of this report. They are as follows:

a. Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation

Provides for payment contracts on multi-family units needing moderate rehabilitation in conjunction with rental assistance. The 1989 housing survey considered the condition of the housing stock, but not for the existing multi-family units in the City. The City will assist the property owners of the multi-family units with information about this program and help coordinate applications.

b. Community Development Block Grant

Provides funding for a wide range of community development activities. Rancho Palos Verdes currently uses these funds for the "Portuguese Bend Landslide Mitigation Project" and has allocated over \$1 million of CDBG funds (since 1984) for landslide mitigation efforts. This landslide is within the only redevelopment project area in the City. The project area consists of approximately two square miles and includes 219 homes which are slated for conservation through these landslide mitigation efforts and monies.

c. California Housing Finance Agency (Direct lending)

Provides loans to housing sponsors for construction or rehabilitation of housing projects containing over five units. The City has 2,179 units that are within structures of five or more units (87% of these units are in structures containing ten or more units). As stated earlier, there are 2,729 apartment units in the City, so this direct lending program could be targeted towards the

rehabilitation of 80% of the City's existing rental stock. Potential environmental constraints on new multi-family housing in the City may be a deterrent to development, but the program may be used in conjunction with a density bonus plan.

d. California Housing Finance Agency (Home ownership/ improvement program

Provides financing of up to 49% of the purchase price of a mortgage participation loan with an institutional lender on behalf of income eligible households for rehabilitation and purchase of housing in areas that are in need of rehabilitation. The 1989 housing condition survey concentrated its efforts in the Eastview area of the City, which could be targeted with this program.

e. California Self-help Housing Program

Provides grants and loans to assist low and moderate income families to build and rehabilitate their own homes. High land costs and home values make the use of this program difficult for new construction in Rancho Palos Verdes, but rehabilitation may be feasible.

f. Mobile Home Park Assistance

Provides financial and technical assistance to mobile home park residents. The Housing Element states that there are no mobile home parks existing in the City. However, the 1990 Census specifies 100 mobile homes. This discrepancy may be due to the mobile home park at the eastern boundary of the City, along Palos Verdes Drive South, being included in a census tract that is both within Rancho Palos Verdes and Los Angeles (San Pedro). The census block data has not been published yet and the correct figure will be determined at that time.

g. Special User Housing Rehabilitation

Program targeted towards substandard housing. The 1989 housing survey indicated 57 housing units in the Eastview area of the City that were in need of "major rehabilitation" (several minor and moderate level repairs necessary). This program could be targeted towards housing units such as these.

h. Rental Housing Construction

Provides cash grants for the construction of housing developments containing at least five units with 30 percent of the units affordable to lower income households. As with the direct lending program (page 7),

this program could be targeted towards the rehabilitation of 80% of the City's existing rental stock. Potential environmental constraints on new multi-family housing in the City may be a deterrent to development, but the program may be used in conjunction with a density bonus plan.

i. Deferred Payment Rehabilitation Loans

Provides loans for the rehabilitation of low and moderate income housing. Again, certain sections of the City could be targeted for such a rehabilitation program.

j. Marks Foran Rehabilitation Loans

Allows revenue bonds for housing rehabilitation. It is known that there are housing units that are in need of rehabilitation and this is an option for the City to pursue.

k. Redevelopment Tax Increment Financing

Allows local agencies to keep increases in taxes for redevelopment areas. Pursuant to State requirements, 20% of the incremental property tax revenues within the redevelopment project area must be set aside for the provision of low and moderate income housing. This tax increment has previously not been available for City use due to litigation proceedings. The County will be releasing the money in phases and has not been able to determine at this time how much tax increment the City will be receiving over time. However, as stated under the description of SB 99, redevelopment construction loans (page 7), the City expects to receive final tax increment figures from the County during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

2. How will the programs be coordinated with the county housing authority?

If the City decides not to create a housing authority, persons from community groups would be designated. Certain programs are administered through the County. When applicants are coordinating with the City for these programs and funds, the City will assist the applicant in filling out applications and will direct the applicant to obtaining necessary background information.

3. What is the City's role in the program?

a. Community Housing Information Program.

The information program will publicize affordable housing programs and funding sources available to qualified households. The program will consist of display racks of information brochures to be located at local libraries, community centers, and city hall. Timing is anticipated for Fiscal Year 1992-93. The Planning Department will coordinate this with the City Manager's office, assisted by the general fund.

b. Second Unit Ordinance Development Standards Brochure.

This will be funded by the general fund and distributed to the local homeowners' associations and senior centers. This should be done during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

4. When will the program be implemented?

During Fiscal Year 1992-93.

Program #9: Evaluate the feasibility of providing rental assistance subsidies to low income families, using CDBG, set-aside funds, and/or housing mitigation fee revenues.

1. How will the City evaluate the feasibility of the program?

The City (coordinated through the City Manager's office) will evaluate how much we expect to receive in CDBG funds, 20% set-aside funds from our redevelopment tax increment funds, and any housing mitigation fees we implement, over the next five years. Staff has already determined the extent of the rental need (Attachment I of this report). Certain funds would be set aside for certain needs groups, depending on how much money is expected.

2. When would the program be implemented if determined feasible?

During Fiscal Year 1992-93.

3. How will the program be coordinated with the county housing authority?

The City will approach apartment owners with the plan for subsidized housing through information bulletins. The City will determine, with the landlord, which households in their building are in a needs group. The City will then contact the County with the needs assessment to determine funding.

4. What are the objectives of the program?

To assist, to the financial extent possible, those needs groups.

Program #11: Develop an expenditure plan for 20% set-aside funds.

1. What are the estimated funds and expenditures through 1994?

As outlined on page 7, this tax increment has previously not been available for City use due to litigation proceedings. The County will be releasing the money in phases and has not been able to determine at this time how much tax increment the City will be receiving over time. However, the City expects to receive final tax increment figures from the County during Fiscal Year 1992-93.

2. How will funds be used to assist low and moderate income households?

The City will determine this when the actual amount has been realized.

Program #12: Prepare standards for on-site employee housing for commercial development.

1. What is the purpose of this program; to require commercial developers to provide affordable housing in exchange for development privileges?

As some of the affordable housing needs (RHNA) in Rancho Palos Verdes is employment driven (as determined by SCAG), the purpose of this program is to make developers provide some housing, or a housing fee, for those very low, low and moderate income employees.

2. What ratio of housing per commercial development area would be required?

The City will determine the number of affordable housing units to be provided by each project on a case-by-case basis. This is necessary because federal and state law require the City to demonstrate a nexus between a particular development project and any affordable housing requirements imposed on that project. In general, however, the City expects 84 units to be created under this program during the life of this Element (in response to SCAG's prediction of a possible 84 units).

3. How will the program be implemented?

As part of the development review process. It will probably be done either through direct on site housing, a development fee, or development of off-site housing within the City for low-income residents.

4. What are the standards for on-site employee housing?

This program has not been evaluated, or produced, at this time and has not been brought before the City Council. Implementation is expected for mid 1992.

5. What income groups are targeted by the program?

Very low to low income employees.

Program #13: Evaluate and, if feasible, implement a housing mitigation fee for new development.

1. What kind and amount of new development would be subject to the fee?

Commercial development and residential subdivisions of five or more lots. Final establishment of the fee would be a policy and legal decision.

2. How will the feasibility of the program be evaluated?

That would depend on the amount of the fee and the extent of the needs in the community.

3. When would the program be implemented?

During Fiscal Year 1992-93.

4. What would the mitigation fee constitute; the cost of providing affordable units?

Rent subsidies.

5. What income groups are targeted by the program?

Very low to low income groups who are overpaying for housing.

6. What are the quantified objectives of the program?

This is provided in the revised implementation table, provided in the next subsection of this attachment.

Program #16: Revise Development Code to reduce time frame for approvals.

1. What kind of permit approvals will receive a reduced time frame?

Sign applications, applications for large family day care, uses permitted in all commercial zones, special use permits, parking lot permits, grading permits, determination of nonconforming signs, extreme slope permits, geologic investigation permits.

In addition to the above mentioned reduced time frames, the revisions to the Development Code have also appeals procedures have been clarified and streamlined and processing procedures in general have been streamlined.

2. What will be the revised approval time frame?

Each level of approval that is eliminated decreases the process by at least two months.

B. Revised Table 25: Implementation Actions

The following extensively revises the existing Table 25 on page VII-3 of the Housing Element. New categories have been added (designated as such in parenthesis), as well as an expanded detail of programs, including a designation of targeted income groups for each program. Many of the previous "implementation actions" are now categorized under "Policy" so that the new implementation actions are much more detailed. Also, certain goals, objectives and programs from the 1981 Housing Element have been included with a more thorough update on those programs. This table will now serve as the framework for the state mandated Housing Element updates to be provided to the City Council and Planning Commission, annually.

TABLE 25 (revised)
IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

I. Goal: Meet the City's designated Regional Housing Needs Assessment for very low, low and moderate income households (new)

A. Objective: Provide affordable housing to all future needs groups (new)

Quantified: Provide at least 38 very low, 46 low and 52 moderate income housing units (new)

1. Policy: Provide assistance to the future needs groups through rental subsidies and mortgage loan assistance (new)

a. Program: Federal Section 8 New Construction - provides funding for the construction of housing affordable to lower income persons (new)

(1) Action: Coordinate information brochures and implementation through the County Housing Authority (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund
\$ 20,000

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services
(Associate or Senior level planner, half time, on-going)

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 start date and to be ongoing thereafter (new)

Target Group: Very Low Income

b. Program: Federal Section 8 Existing - provides rent subsidies to low-income renters. The majority of rents in the City exceed the ceiling levels set for participation in the program, but some needs households do exist. (new)

(1) Action: Continue regular review of rental rates by City Council subcommittee

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: City Council administration

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Group: Very Low Income

c. Program: Evaluate the feasibility of providing rental assistance subsidies to very low, low and moderate income families, using CDBG, set-aside funds or housing mitigation fee revenues

(1) Action: Coordinate with Los Angeles County Housing and other agencies

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

d. Program: Evaluate and, if feasible, implement a housing mitigation fee for new development through conditions of approval or specific plan regulations to be allocated to an affordable housing fund

(1) Action: Prepare appropriate studies and ordinances (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services/Redevelopment Agency

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

2. Policy: Provide a variety of housing for future needs groups (new)

a. Program: Determine which of the following might best supplement the existing housing stock: single-family conversion, garage units, grandparent cottages (granny flats), accessory apartments, others

(1) Action: Appropriate ordinances

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

b. Program: Work with existing agencies to expand housing services in the City: house sharing, group care, congregate homes, outreach efforts

(1) Action: Establish lines of communication

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

c. Program: Complete study and hearings of mixed-use ordinance

(1) Action: Appropriate ordinances

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

d. Program: Accommodation of at least 40 domestic quarters within new homes or additions to existing homes

(1) Action: Develop an expenditure plan for the 20% set-aside funds

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services/Finance

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

(2) Action: Establish a permit tracking system to identify domestic quarters and provide information to appropriate employment and housing agencies

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

e. Program: Prepare standards for on-site employee housing for commercial development through conditional use permits or specific plan regulations

(1) Action: Prepare appropriate ordinances (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low and Low Income

3. Policy: Minimize restrictions to affordable housing

a. Program: Establish staff responsibility to monitor affordable housing restrictions

(1) Action: Designate staff member and develop tracking and enforcement procedures

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services/City Attorney

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

b. Program: Revise Development Code to reduce time frame for approvals

(1) Action: Prepare appropriate ordinances (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services/City Attorney

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

B. Objective: Provide affordable housing to all future special needs groups (new)

Quantified: Provide affordable housing to the projected 15 large family households and the projected 83 female-headed households (new)

1. Policy: Monitor state and federal housing programs and funding to determine resources available to special needs groups

a. Program: Periodic review of pertinent programs and legislation

(1) Action: Staff person to review data as it is available (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

II. Goal: Provide affordable housing for the City's designated very low, low and moderate income households (new)

A. Objective: Provide affordable housing to all existing needs groups (new)

Quantified: Provide at least 38 very low, 46 low and 52 moderate income housing units (new)

1. Policy: Provide assistance to the existing needs groups through rental subsidies and mortgage loan assistance (new)

a. Program: Federal Section 8 New Construction - provides funding for the construction of housing affordable to lower income persons (new)

(1) Action: Coordinate information brochures and implementation through the County Housing Authority (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund
\$ 20,000

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services
(Associate or Senior
level planner, half
time, ongoing)

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 and
ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and
Moderate Income

b. Program: Federal Section 8 Existing - provides rent
subsidies to low-income renters. The
majority of rents in the City exceed the
ceiling levels set for participation in the
program, but some needs households do exist.
(new)

(1) Action: Continue regular review of rental rates
by City Council subcommittee

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: City Council
administration

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Group: Very Low Income

c. Program: Evaluate the feasibility of providing rental
assistance subsidies to very low, low and
moderate income families, using CDBG, set-
aside funds or housing mitigation fee
revenues

(1) Action: Coordinate with Los Angeles County
Housing and other agencies

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 and
ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and
Moderate Income

B. Objective: Provide affordable housing to all existing
special needs groups (new)

Quantified: Provide affordable housing to the projected 15 large family households, the projected 83 female-headed households and the projected elderly households in need (new)

1. Policy: Provide housing for the special needs groups such as the handicapped, the elderly, overcrowded housing, farm workers, the homeless (new)

a. Program: Continue to provide the 12 moderate income housing units at the Marriott Lifecare Center

(1) Action: Approved for development (new)

(a) Funding source: Developer financed (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services (new)

(c) Schedule: Project pending resolution of litigation

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

b. Program: Accommodation of at least 30 senior home-sharing arrangements in existing homes

(1) Action: Implement a home-sharing program for seniors and coordinate with the Peninsula Seniors, Los Angeles County and other agencies

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 and ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

c. Program: Continue to evaluate the 1990 Census data regarding unique household characteristics

(1) Action: Staff person to review data as it is available (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| (b) Responsibility: | Environmental Services |
| (c) Schedule: | Fiscal Year 1992-93 and ongoing |
| Target Groups: | Very Low, Low and Moderate Income |

III. Goal: Improve the existing affordable housing (new)

A. Objective: Maintain the quality environment of the community (new)

Quantified: Improve, repair and rehabilitate up to ten substandard very low, low and moderate income housing units

1. Policy: Provide improvement subsidies to very low, low and moderate income households that meet the eligibility requirements for the CDBG program or the 20% set-aside fund related to the City's redevelopment project area
2. Policy: Evaluate opportunities to fund rehabilitation of low/moderate income housing

a. Program: Federal Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation - provides for payment contracts on multi-family units needing moderate rehabilitation in conjunction with rental assistance. (new)

(1) Action: Coordinate with Los Angeles County Housing or other agencies to assist property owners of multi-family units with information about this program and help coordinate applications.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| (a) Funding source: | General fund (new) |
| (b) Responsibility: | Environmental Services (new) |
| (c) Schedule: | Fiscal Year 1992-93 and ongoing |

Target Groups: Low and Moderate Income

b. Program: California Housing Finance Agency Direct lending - provides loans to housing sponsors for construction or rehabilitation of housing projects containing over five units. (new)

(1) Action: Coordinate with Los Angeles County Housing or other agencies to assist property owners of multi-family units with information about this program and help coordinate applications. (new)

(a) Funding source: General fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services (new)

(c) Schedule: Fiscal year 1992-93 and ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

(2) Action: Address fair housing complaints through community organizations coordinated with the Metro-Harbor Fair Housing Council

(a) Funding source: Department budget

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

2. Objective: Continue the provision of existing affordable units (new)

Quantified objective: Continue to supply the ten moderate income units at the Villa Capri condominium development

a. Policy: Evaluate regulatory options for discouraging or prohibiting conversions of apartments to condominiums

(1) Action: Possible amendments to subdivision or conditional use permit regulations

(a) Funding source: General fund

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 and ongoing

Target Groups: Moderate Income

b. Policy: Develop an ordinance implementing the state density bonus law

(1) Action: Prepare appropriate ordinances

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| (a) Funding Source: | General fund |
| (b) Responsibility: | Environmental Services |
| (c) Schedule: | Fiscal Year 1992-93 and ongoing |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Target Groups: | Very Low, Low and Moderate Income |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|

(2) Action: Continue to accommodate manufactured housing in residential zones

| | |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| (a) Funding source: | General fund |
| (b) Responsibility: | Environmental Services |
| (c) Schedule: | Ongoing |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Target Groups: | Very Low, Low and Moderate Income |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|

IV. Goal: Preserve the City's existing housing stock (new)

A. Objective: Provide incentives to homeowners for upgrading and maintaining their homes (new)

Quantified: Improve, repair or rehabilitate up to ten substandard housing units

1. Policy: Establish neighborhood preservation and beautification efforts

(1) Action: Continue existing recycling grants program

| | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Funding source: | Department budget |
| (b) Responsibility: | Environmental Services/Public Works |
| (c) Schedule: | Ongoing |

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Target Groups: | Moderate Income |
|----------------|-----------------|

B. Objective: Preserve the housing stock in the landslide area

Quantified: Conserve 219 existing housing units within the City's redevelopment project area

1. Policy: Continue stabilization efforts related to the landslide area

(1) Action: Grading and cleaning of Portuguese Canyon to restore natural drainage. To ensure proper drainage, a 1/2 round CMP pipe will be placed at the bottom of the canyon (new: to be addressed in 1992-93 annual budget)

(a) Funding source: Community development Block Grant
\$ 30,000 (new: to be addressed in 1992-93 annual budget)

(b) Responsibility: Public Works (new: from 92-93 annual budget)

(c) Schedule: Fiscal Year 1992-93 (new)

Target Groups: Low and Moderate Income

(2) Action: Construction of shoreline protection to prevent erosion of material on a temporary basis (new: from 92-93 annual budget)

(a) Funding source: Community Development Block Grant
\$ 136,314 (new: from 91-92 annual budget)

(b) Responsibility: Public Works (new: from 91-92 annual budget)

(c) Schedule: Late 1992

Target Groups: Low and Moderate Income

2. Policy: Continue funding and support for RDA landslide abatement efforts

(1) Action: Continue current efforts and complete adopted projects

(a) Funding source: Department budget

(b) Responsibility: Redevelopment Agency

(c) Schedule: ongoing

Target Groups: Low and Moderate Income

(2) Action: Continue to pursue financing for residents in the Redevelopment area

(a) Funding source: Department budget

(b) Responsibility: Redevelopment Agency

(c) Schedule: ongoing

Target Groups: Low and Moderate Income

V. Goal: Promote a range of housing types

A. Objective: Provide housing to not only meet the RHNA needs but to meet the needs of the community and the surrounding area

Quantified: Provide the required number of RHNA housing, including above market rate housing

1. Policy: Encourage a variety of housing types in new development, including rentals, which will maintain the present predominance of single-family residences found throughout the community

(1) Action: Approve and support a skilled care elderly housing project, in part to provide for low income elderly

(a) Funding source: General Fund (new)

(a) Responsibility: Environmental Services (new)

(b) Schedule: Project approved and ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

(2) Action: Permit residential planned development city-wide and require in the coastal area

(a) Funding source: General Fund (new)

(a) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(b) Schedule: Ongoing through existing ordinances

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

(3) Action: Permit manufactured homes on all buildable single-family residential lots in the City

(a) Funding source: General Fund (new)

(a) Responsibility: Environmental Services (new)

(b) Schedule: Ongoing through existing ordinances

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

(4) Action: Provide senior housing through area block grant monies

(a) Funding source: General Fund (new)

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services (new)

(c) Schedule: Ongoing through existing ordinances

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

2. Policy: Discourage conversion of apartments and prohibit conversion when City vacancy rate is less than 5%, since this further limits the economic range of housing

(1) Action: Monitor vacancy rates and provide several program incentives to apartment owners

(a) Funding source: Department budget

(b) Responsibility: Environmental Services

(c) Schedule: Early 1993 and ongoing

Target Groups: Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C124910939

